

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-16 were pending and rejected. Claims 1, 4, 12 and 13 are being amended. Claim 16 is being canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-15 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In sections 3 and 4, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11 and 16 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz.

Aziz discloses a system for controlling an extensible computer system. A virtual server farm is created out of a computing grid. Allocation and control of the elements in the virtual server farm are performed by a control plane connected to all computing, networking and storage elements in the computing grid through special control ports. The control plane comprises a control mechanism hierarchy that includes one or more master control process mechanisms communicatively coupled to one or more slave control process mechanisms. The one or more master control process mechanisms instruct the slave control process mechanisms to establish virtual server farms by selecting subsets of processing and storage resources.

Salkewicz discloses a method in which IP packets are routed within a first ISP's domain from a single network device with a first database. The first database includes addresses of the first ISP. IP packets are also routed within a second ISP's domain from a single network device with a second database. The second database, which is separate from the first database, includes addresses of the second ISP.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites "a router... wherein the router receives packets from the virtual private network, each packet having a VPN ID, wherein the router uses the VPN ID and a dedicated virtual routing table to filter packets to the virtual router associated with the VPN ID, wherein the virtual router adds tag information based on the VPN ID to the packets before transmitting the packets to the virtual LAN switch, thereby enabling virtual separation of packets within the router and enabling IP addresses spaces within a private address range to overlap between different clients." Independent claim 1 as amended further recites "a virtual

LAN switch... , said virtual LAN switch using the tag information and a dedicated server table to forward the packets to an appropriate one of said at least one server.” Independent claim 1 as amended still further recites “an FC switch... wherein the FC switch uses the server identification information and a storage table to determine an appropriate one of said at least one volume, to confirm rights of the server to access the determined volume, and to forward the packets from the server to the determined one of said at least one volume.”

Neither Aziz nor Salkewicz discloses “a router... wherein the router receives packets from the virtual private network, each packet having a VPN ID, wherein the router uses the VPN ID and a dedicated virtual routing table to filter packets to the virtual router associated with the VPN ID, wherein the virtual router adds tag information based on the VPN ID to the packets before transmitting the packets to the virtual LAN switch, thereby enabling virtual separation of packets within the router and enabling IP addresses spaces within a private address range to overlap between different clients,” “a virtual LAN switch... , said virtual LAN switch using the tag information and a dedicated server table to forward the packets to an appropriate one of said at least one server,” and “an FC switch... wherein the FC switch uses the server identification information and a storage table to determine an appropriate one of said at least one volume, to confirm rights of the server to access the determined volume, and to forward the packets from the server to the determined one of said at least one volume.”

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8-11 which depend therefrom are patentable for at least these reasons.

In section 5, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Akahane and Poisson. The Examiner argues that Akahane and Poisson disclose a VPN table containing the specific fields claimed. However, neither Akahane nor Poisson discloses “a router... wherein the router receives packets from the virtual private network, each packet having a VPN ID, wherein the router uses the VPN ID and a dedicated virtual routing table to filter packets to the virtual router associated with the VPN ID, wherein the virtual router adds tag information based on the VPN ID to the packets before

transmitting the packets to the virtual LAN switch, thereby enabling virtual separation of packets within the router and enabling IP addresses spaces within a private address range to overlap between different clients,” “a virtual LAN switch... , said virtual LAN switch using the tag information and a dedicated server table to forward the packets to an appropriate one of said at least one server,” and “an FC switch... wherein the FC switch uses the server identification information and a storage table to determine an appropriate one of said at least one volume, to confirm rights of the server to access the determined volume, and to forward the packets from the server to the determined one of said at least one volume.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

In section 6, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Kim. The Examiner argues that Kim discloses a system for managing server configurations having a server table outlining the fields claimed. However, Kim does not disclose “a router... wherein the router receives packets from the virtual private network, each packet having a VPN ID, wherein the router uses the VPN ID and a dedicated virtual routing table to filter packets to the virtual router associated with the VPN ID, wherein the virtual router adds tag information based on the VPN ID to the packets before transmitting the packets to the virtual LAN switch, thereby enabling virtual separation of packets within the router and enabling IP addresses spaces within a private address range to overlap between different clients,” “a virtual LAN switch... , said virtual LAN switch using the tag information and a dedicated server table to forward the packets to an appropriate one of said at least one server,” and “an FC switch... wherein the FC switch uses the server identification information and a storage table to determine an appropriate one of said at least one volume, to confirm rights of the server to access the determined volume, and to forward the packets from the server to the determined one of said at least one volume.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

In section 7, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Blumenau. The Examiner argues that Blumenau discloses a system for configuring a data storage unit consisting of a table having the fields claimed. However, Blumenau does not disclose “a router... wherein the router receives packets from the virtual private network, each packet having a VPN ID, wherein the router uses the VPN ID and a dedicated virtual routing table to filter packets to the virtual router associated with the VPN ID, wherein the virtual router adds tag information based on the VPN ID to the packets before transmitting the packets to the virtual LAN switch, thereby enabling virtual separation of packets within the router and enabling IP addresses spaces within a private address range to overlap between different clients,” “a virtual LAN switch... , said virtual LAN switch using the tag information and a dedicated server table to forward the packets to an appropriate one of said at least one server,” and “an FC switch... wherein the FC switch uses the server identification information and a storage table to determine an appropriate one of said at least one volume, to confirm rights of the server to access the determined volume, and to forward the packets from the server to the determined one of said at least one volume.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

In section 8, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Yamamoto. The Examiner argues that Yamamoto discloses a status mapping table which correlates a server ID along with a failure and active status information. However, Yamamoto does not disclose “a router... wherein the router receives packets from the virtual private network, each packet having a VPN ID, wherein the router uses the VPN ID and a dedicated virtual routing table to filter packets to the virtual router associated with the VPN ID, wherein the virtual router adds tag information based on the VPN ID to the packets before transmitting the packets to the virtual LAN switch, thereby enabling virtual separation of packets within the router and enabling IP addresses spaces within a private address range to overlap between different clients,” “a virtual LAN switch... , said virtual LAN switch using the tag information and a dedicated server table to forward the packets to an appropriate one of said at least one server,” and “an FC switch... wherein the FC switch uses the

server identification information and a storage table to determine an appropriate one of said at least one volume, to confirm rights of the server to access the determined volume, and to forward the packets from the server to the determined one of said at least one volume.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 650-843-3392.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2005
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By Marc A. Sockol
Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O.

Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

Date: June 16, 2005 By: Cathi L.G. Thoorsell
Cathi L.G. Thoorsell